

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/894,007	FOUGHT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John P Trimmings	2133

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) John P Trimmings.

(3) _____.

(2) Gregory D. Caldwell.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2004

Time: 4:15 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

31-48

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and applicant discussed new claims 31-48, and patentability of each of the three independent claims 31, 38 and 44. It was agreed that the claims are allowable based on the following:

As per Claims 32,33,34,35 and 37: The 1st line of each claim should begin with the recitation, "The method of Claim 31".

The applicant has canceled Claim 36.

The applicant has canceled Claim 47.

The applicant has amended Claim 31 beginning at line 10, deleting the recitation to the end of the claim. And, beginning at line 10, adding the following: "determining that the buffer circuit is operational by generating a pass signal in response to a difference between the delay of the strobe signal associated with the first signal and the delay of the strobe signal associated with the second signal being indicative of an improper strobe window.".

The applicant has amended Claim 44 beginning at the last line 9, deleting the period at the end of the claim. And, beginning at line 9 after the last word of the claim, adding the following: "indicating a pass status in response to a difference between the delay of the strobe signal associated with at least one latched bit differing from its corresponding driven bit and the delay of the strobe signal associated with all latched bits differ from their corresponding driven bits being indicative of a proper strobe window.".

It was also agreed that Claim 38 is allowable in its present form..